DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 621 EA 022 137

TITLE Interim Consortium of Institutes for Development and Research in Education in Europe: Report of the Initial Meeting in The Hague, the Netherlands, December 15 and 16, 1989.

INSTITUTION Institute for Educational Research in the Netherlands (SVO), The Hague.; National Inst. for Curriculum Development (SLO), Enschede (Netherlands).

PUB DATE Apr 90

NOTE 25p.; For a related document, see EA 021 840.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Conferences; *Consortia; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Meetings

IDENTIFIERS *Europe

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the results of a meeting of representatives from 12 European institutes for curriculum development and educational research. The meeting, held in December 1989 in the Hague, Netherlands, considered the desirability and feasibility of establishing a European consortium of institutes for development and research in education. The report is intended to: (1) help participants elaborate on ideas developed during the meeting and continue the decision-making process and idea development in their own institutes; and (2) inform institutes, organizations, and other persons interested in the consortium idea. Following a brief summary of the meeting's aims, participants, and organization, a general discussion section outlines participant's opinions about the consortium idea and gives information about ideas and initiatives developed during the meeting. The third section explains the agreed upon formula for 1990, namely the provisional realization of ideas in the form or an Interim-CIDREE, proposed actions, and the year's program. The fourth section discusses possibilities for organizing workshops and small conferences and bringing these activities into the Interim-CIDREE. A fifth section details information dissemination plans and includes contact names and telephone numbers for obtaining more information. Participants support the consortium idea and are unanimous in desiring a nonbureaucratic structure. A professional executive committee has been established to elaborate further on the CIDREE formula. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322621

Interim Consortium of Institutes for Development and Research in Education in Europe

Report of the initial meeting in the Hague, the Netherlands, December 15 and 16 1989

Interim Consortium of Institutes for Development and Research in Education in Europe I-CIDREE

April 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Hamse

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

National Institute for Curriculum Development

SVO

Institute for Educational Research in the Netherlands

EA 022 137

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If you wish any further information about the programme and activities of the interim-CIDREE, please contact:

Drs. Hans Hooghoff, coordinator
National Institute for Curriculum Development
P.O. Box 2041
7500 CA ENSCHEDE
the Netherlands
tel: (0)53 - 840392
fax: (0)53 - 307692

Ria Benamirouche, secretary
National Institute for Curriculum Development
P.O. Box 2041
7500 CA ENSCHEDE
the Netherlands
tel: (0)53 - 840204
fax: (0)53 - 307692

Dr. Hans Lodewijks, chairman Provisional Executive Committee
National Institute for Educational Research
Sweelinckplein 14
2517 GK THE HAGUE
the Netherlands
tel: (0)70 - 3469679
fax: (0)70 - 3469679

Table of contents

Participants 5

Introduction 7

1. Main facts about the meeting 9
   1.1. Aim of the meeting 9
   1.2. Participants 9
   1.3. Location 10
   1.4. Time 10
   1.5. Discussion paper 10
   1.6. Budget 13

2. General discussion about philosophy, budget and policy 15
   2.1. About the philosophy of CIDREE 15
        2.1.1. Idea 15
        2.1.2. Efficiency 15
        2.1.3. Structure 15
        2.1.4. The scope of the issues 16
   2.2. About the budget of CIDREE 16
        2.2.1. Funds 16
        2.2.2. Overheads 16
        2.2.3. Additional investment 16
   2.3. About the policy of CIDREE 16
        2.3.1. Involvement 16
        2.3.2. Domain of cooperation 16
        2.3.3. Criteria 17
        2.3.4. Workshops 17

Intermezzo 17

3. The agreed formula for the starting year 1990; conclusions, decisions, actions 19
   3.1. Structure of the consortium 19
        3.1.1. Principle 19
        3.1.2. Interim-CIDREE 19
        3.1.3. Development 19
        3.1.4. Internal structure 20
   3.2. Activities in 1990; programme and conditions 20
        3.2.1. The programme of activities 20
        3.2.2. The organic growth of the Interim-CIDREE 20
        3.3.3. The costs 21
        3.3.4. The language 21
        3.3.5. Liaison 21

4. Ideas offered for workshops and seminars; criteria 23
4.1. Offers for activities 23
4.2. Criteria 25

5. What next? 27

Information 27

Participants

1. Mrs. Jenny Hall, Assistant Chief Executive, National Curriculum Council, NCC, 15-17 New Street, York YO1 2RA, ENGLAND, tel.: 44.904. 622533, fax : 44.904. 622921

2. Dr. Seamus Hegarty, Deputy Director, National Foundation for Educational Research, NFER, The Mere, Upton Park, Slough SL1 2BQ, ENGLAND, tel.: 44.753. 74123, fax : 44.753. 691632

3. Mr. David McNicoll, Chief Executive, Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum, SCCC, 17 St. John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8DG, SCOTLAND, tel.: 44.31. 5574888, fax : 44.31. 5572085

4. Dr. Pamela Munn, Scottish Council for Research in Education, SCRE, 15 St. John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR, SCOTLAND, tel.: 44.31. 5572944, fax : 44.31. 5569454

5. Prof. Dr. Jacques Colomb, Directeur de Programmes, Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique, INRP, 29, Rue d'Ulm, 75230 Paris 05, FRANCE, tel.: 33.1. 4634.9000 (4634.9084), fax : 33.1.43543201

6. Mme. Emilie Barrier, Centre International d'Etudes Pédagogique, CIEP, 1, Avenue Léon Journault, 92311 Sèvres, FRANCE, tel.: 1.45.34. 7527-374, fax : 1.43.37. 9961

7. Prof. Dr. F. Laevers, Institute for Research of Education, Catholic University of Leuven, Vesaliusstraat 2, Leuven, BELGIUM, tel.: 32.16. 286203, fax : 32.16. 286000

8. Dr. Hans Hamber, Director Curriculum, Skolöverstyrelsen, S-10642 Stockholm, SWEDEN, tel.: 46.8. 7832000, fax : 46.8. 7832378

9. Dr. Alfredo Fierro, Deputy Director Development, Ministerio de Educacion y Ciencia, Los Madrazo 17-3, 28014 Madrid, SPAIN, tel.: 34.1. 5221100 (2314530), fax : 34.1. 5213775 (5229256)

10. Dr. Heinz Schirp, Landesinstitut für Schule, und Weiterbildung, Paradieserweg 64, 4770 Soest (NRW), GERMANY, tel.: 49.2921. 683254, fax : 49.2921. 683228

11. Dr. Veikko Lepistö, National Board of General Education, NBGE, Hakaniemenkatu 2, SF 00530 Helsinki 53, FINLAND, tel.: 358.0. 7062332, fax : 358.0. 7062865

12. Dr. Hans Lodewijks, Director, Dutch Institute for Educational Research, SVO, Sweelinckplein 14, 2517 GK Den Haag, THE NETHERLANDS, tel.: 31.70. 3469679, fax : 31.70. 3469679

13. Dr. Paul Vedder, Dutch Institute for Educational Research, SVO, Sweelinckplein 14, 2517 GK Den Haag, THE NETHERLANDS, tel.: 31.70. 3469679, fax : 31.70. 3469679

14. Mr. Piet de Bruijne, Director, Dutch National Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, P.O. Box 2041, 7500 CA Enschede, THE NETHERLANDS, tel.: 31.53. 840201, fax : 31.53. 307692

15. Drs. Johan van Bruggen, Dutch National Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, P.O. Box 2041, 7500 CA Enschede, THE NETHERLANDS, tel.: 31.53. 840203, fax : 31.53. 307692

16. Drs. Hans Hooghoff, Dutch National Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, P.O. Box 2041, 7500 CA Enschede, THE NETHERLANDS, tel.: 31.53. 840392, fax : 31.53. 307692

17. Mrs. Viola Apeldoorn, Dutch Institute for Educational Research, SVO, Sweelinckplein 14, 2517 GK Den Haag, THE NETHERLANDS, tel.: 31.70. 3469679, fax : 31.70. 3469679

18. Mrs. Ria Benamirouche, Dutch National Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, P O Box 2041, 7500 CA Enschede, THE NETHERLANDS, tel.: 31.53. 840392, fax : 31.53. 307692

Introduction

This report gives the result of a meeting of representatives of twelve European institutes for curriculum development and educational research. The meeting was held on 15 and 16 December 1989 in the Hague, the Netherlands. The aim of the meeting was to consider the desirability and feasibility of establishing a European consortium of institutes for development and research in education. Ideas about such a consortium were put forward in a discussion paper for the meeting. This discussion paper "European Consortium of Institutes for Development and Research in Education" has been circulated widely among institutes in Europe. The function of this report of the meeting is:

a. to help the participants in their further work in the elaboration of the ideas that have been developed during the meeting. Ideas for a trial period of an Interim-Consortium of Institutes for Development and Research in Education in Europe, CIDREE (this is the name that will be used provisionally).
b. to help the participants in the further decision making process about participation and development of the idea in their own institutes.
c. to inform institutes, organisations and persons who were not represented at the meeting, but have shown interest in the consortium idea or will be approached in 1990.

The content of this report is:

1. Main facts about the meeting.
   For a quick look, this section gives information about aim, participants and organisation of the meeting.
2. General discussion.
   This section gives a summary of the opinions of the participants about the consortium idea, as presented in the discussion paper. It also gives information about ideas and initiatives developed during the meeting.
3. The agreed formula for the trial year 1990; conclusions; actions.
   This section informs about the conclusions of the representatives of the twelve institutes; about the provisional realisation of the ideas in the form of an "Interim-CIDREE" and about actions to be undertaken and also about the programme for 1990.
4. Offered ideas for activities and criteria.
   This section contains more detailed information about possibilities which each representative saw for organising workshops and small conferences and to bring these activities into the "Interim-CIDREE". There is also a part about the criteria for the programme. The Programme Committee that has been installed, can use the ideas offered and the criteria as the main source for their work in the coming months.
5. What next?
   This section gives some information about plans, contacts, etc..

First we summarize the main results.

a. *The conclusion that the consortium idea is a good one and is worth investment by the institutes to realise the idea.*
b. *The unanimous feeling that we do not want a heavy bureaucratic structure. Practical cooperation has to be realised as soon as possible and with as few overheads as possible.*
c. *1990 has to be a trial year. During this year the group of representatives of twelve institutes will act as an "Interim-CIDREE".*
d. *A list of 18 provisional offerings for workshops for professional staff, to be organised by the offering institute, has been formulated.*
e. *A programme committee has been established. The committee wil formulate a programme of some 4 to 7 activities for 1990 and take all action that is needed to realise this programme.*
f. *A professional executive committee has been established. Its main task will be the further elaboration of the CIDREE formula. The provisional executive committee will also prepare, on the basis of its own work and of contacts with institutes and organisations, a new meeting of the same group as in December 1989 for 8th and 9th June 1990 in England. The provisional executive committee will consider the possibility of organising a founding conference of the consortium in December 1990.*

1. Main facts about the meeting

The initiative for the meeting was taken by the two Dutch national institutes for curriculum development and educational research, SLO and SVO. SLO stands for: National Institute for Curriculum Development, in Enschede; SVO stands for Institute for Educational Research in the Netherlands, in the Hague. Based on discussions with people from various
institutes and contacts with international organisations, the ideas were
developed and elaborated in a discussion paper for the meeting of 15 and 16 December 1989.

1.1. Aim of the meeting

- To consider the feasibility of the core of the idea concerning the establishment of an European consortium.
- To discuss various problems, concerning the elaboration of the idea. For example the programming of activities, the budget, the membership, the cooperation with international organisations. For these matters the discussion paper gave some elaboration.
- To come to an agreement about further development of the idea and about possible actions in the short term.

1.2. Participants

SVO and SLO decided that it would be best to start with a rather small conference with some 15 people. This was the reason for sending out closed invitations to only a limited number of institutes/persons. The second reason was that only those persons were invited of whom the organisers knew from earlier contacts that they probably would be willing to invest time and energy in the elaboration of the consortium idea. In essence, the list of invited persons (and participants, because all accepted the invitation) was somewhat arbitrary. The following persons, representing their institutes in a non-formal way, were present in the Hague.

1. Jacques Colomb, Institut National de Récherche Pedagogique (INRP), Paris, France
2. Jenny Hall, National Curriculum Council (NCC), York, England
3. Seamus Hegarty, National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), Slough, England
4. David McNicoll, Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (SCCC), Edinburgh, Scotland
5. Pamela Munn, Scottish Council for Research in Education (SCRE), Edinburgh, Scotland

6. Emilie Barrier, Centre International d'Etudes Pédagogique (CIEP), Sèvres, France
7. F. Laevers, Institute for Research of Education, Catholic University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
8. Hans Hamber, Skolöverstyrelsen, Stockholm, Sweden
9. Alfredo Fierro, Ministerio de Educacion y Ciencia, Madrid, Spain
10. Heinz Schirp, Landesinstitut für Schule, und Weiterbildung (LSW), Soest (NRW), Germany
11. Veikko Lepistö, National Board of General Education (NBGE), Helsinki, Finland
12. Hans Lodewijks, Dutch Institute for Educational Research (SVO), Den Haag, the Netherlands
13. Paul Vedder, Dutch Institute for Educational Research (SVO), Den Haag, the Netherlands
14. Piet de Bruijne, Dutch National Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO), Enschede, the Netherlands
15. Johan van Bruggen, Dutch National Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO), Enschede, the Netherlands
16. Hans Hooghoff, Dutch National Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO), Enschede, the Netherlands
17. Viola Apeldoorn, Dutch Institute for Educational Research (SVO), Den Haag, the Netherlands
18. Ria Benamirouche, Dutch National Institute for curriculum development (SLO), Enschede, the Netherlands

Some weeks before the meeting information about the meeting and the discussion paper was sent to several other institutes and organisations in Europe. Several institutes gave reactions, most of them positive.

1.3. Location

The meeting was hosted by SVO and SLO (hotels, meals, accommodation). The conference took place in the office of SVO in the Hague.

1.4. Time

The conference started on Friday at 15.00 p.m. and ended on Saturday 15.00 p.m.. So most of the participants only had to invest two days for the meeting and travelling.

1.5. Discussion paper

The paper (23 pages) describes the core of the idea and the background and it gives elaborations on important points such as programming, relationships with existing networks, existing programmes and international organisations. It also deals with practical issues (language, budget, secretariat). Its author was Johan van Bruggen (SLO).
For readers of this report, who cannot read the discussion paper, we quote the section in which the core of the idea was described.

"... 2. BACKGROUND OF THE IDEA

2.1 Contacts as a source

During study visits and international conferences in the past six years, we have had the opportunity to talk with staff members and directors of institutes for curriculum development and educational research in various countries, especially in Western Europe. On our part, we have received visitors from various foreign institutions and agencies. During conferences of a more general nature, we have established contacts with several organisations of subject teachers, for instance of mathematics, science, social studies, languages. We have also participated in some more general conferences hosted by AERA, OECD, Unesco, EARLI (European Association for Research in Learning and Instruction), Council of Europe, the European Commission, and the European Forum on Educational Administration. Of course, we don't have a complete picture.

2.2 Reflections

These contacts, which were followed up and expanded by exchanging materials and information, have shown that these insititutes know little about each other's work, about the comparability of approaches in curriculum development and research and about the similarity of research results and products of developmental work. We are impressed by the apparent possibilities for using the results of work carried out by individual institutes in other countries. Of course, these products will have to be translated and adapted, but it seems obvious that lots of time and energy and, in consequence, money can thus be saved. Training of staff could be coordinated. New research and development could be started, based on cooperation. We believe that this pragmatic consideration alone justifies an investigation into the feasibility of setting up a consortium, as described in paragraph 1. Of course, there are also ideological considerations with regard to international cooperation and exchange, especially in view of Europe after 1992.

2.3 Examples

In order to give a better idea of what is proposed in paragraph 2.2 we shall now present some examples which illustrate the aims of the consortium, as we begin to see these:

a. In the past few years SLO staff members have developed a piece of interactive courseware which enables young primary school pupils (8 years old) to master multiplication problems and to memorise multiplication tables. Towards the completion of the development process we visited the INRP in Paris and learned that staff members there were doing exactly the same thing for division and the memorisation of division tables. The didactic approach and the ideas about mathematics education underlying the two projects were 90% similar. Obviously, it would be profitable for both parties to translate each other's courseware and adjust it to their own computer systems.

b. At the Landesinstitut für Schule und Weiterbildung in Northrheinland Westphalia (FRG) we found a fine piece of work for religious education of Islamic children which had been achieved in cooperation with experts from the universities of Cairo and Ankara and written down in a document with a curriculum proposal and a textbook. It was immediately obvious that the SLO could use this work for the same target group in the Netherlands. At the moment we are finishing the preparation of the elaboration of this piece of work. Thus, the SLO is able to save a great deal of money which may be deployed for development work in other areas.

c. Several European countries have conducted studies of the way in which schools develop their school work plans. Instances that come to mind are: the school-based evaluation in the United Kingdom, research into the development of local school plans commissioned by the Swedish NBE, and similar studies conducted in the Netherlands. We think that much of the research could have been exchanged and that in that way the institutes involved could have profited from each other's work.

d. In January 1989 the Landesinstitut für Schule und Weiterbildung of Northrheinland Westphalia, the Hessisches Institut für Bildung und Schule (HIBS) and the SLO hosted a meeting of about 60 developers, consultants and trainers in the domain of minority languages (Arab, Turkish, Greek, Spanish, etc.). The aim was not only to exchange experiences and materials, but especially to discuss the definition of the cultural component of this type of language teaching.

e. Several countries are building a system of national assessment of educational achievement with long-term programmes. The work of the Assessment of Performance Unit (APU) in the United Kingdom (linked up with the work of the National Foundation for Educational Research) is well-known. But in Sweden (NBE), in the Netherlands (CITO, commissioned by SVO and in cooperation with the SLO) and in France (Sprese) the same type of developmental work is being done. We have noticed that, with some adjustments, it is possible to use the results of this work (tests, observation schemes, etc.) in other countries as well. cooperation could thus save a lot of energy. And of course this work may be linked up with new programmes of the IEA.

f. In cooperation with other agencies, the Institut für die Pädagogik der Naturwissenschaften in Kiel has developed a programme for the use of computers in special education. We think that the materials developed in this programme could very well be used in other countries. A start has just been made in the Netherlands.

g. In several countries the issue of values education is gaining importance. Some universities (Fribourg in Switzerland, Konstanz in FRG, Nijmegen in the Netherlands and probably some more) are conducting studies in this field that are based on similar ideas about values education. Research methods, observation formats and tests could probably be used in several countries and the connection with curriculum development could be made.

These examples probably illustrate our thinking. We could also give some examples about vocational profiles, information technology, attainment targets for general education, research of teacher thinking related to the use of curricular materials etc.

It will probably be useful to gather more examples based on other experiences than ours. An elaboration of examples and possibilities can help us in establishing the consortium, especially if we analyse them in relation to the possible functions of the consortium."
(unquote)

1.6. Budget

Participants had to pay their travelling expenses themselves. SVO and SLO paid the remaining conference costs (hotels, meals, accommodation).

2. General discussion about philosophy, budget and policy

This paragraph does not give a detailed report of the lengthy discussions on Friday about the formula for the consortium and all kinds of important problems concerning organisation, programming and practical problems. We only summarise a list of key remarks that reflect the general feeling of the participants in the meeting.

2.1. About the philosophy of CIDREE

2.1.1. Idea

The consortium idea is potentially a good one. It can lead to a network, different from the existing ones. Am important factor is that it combines small-scale professional work with focus-effective output. It can also have a positive effect on the quality of work, so it is also a method of professional development. Important for the idea is the involvement of professional staff of participating institutes, staff who are concerned with common problems.

2.1.2. Efficiency

The flexibility of the activities and networks to be developed around them is more important than completeness of the work of the Interim-CIDREE. Cooperation with existing networks and European organisations is important to raise efficiency and to avoid overlap. The efficiency of the work of the Interim-CIDREE can be increased by using information that is already available (databases like EUDISED, EURYDICE and others). But also by using newer methods of communication (telefax, electronic mail, teleconference) instead of expensive workshops.

2.1.3. Structure

The consortium has to become a structure in which professionals can cooperate on the basis of the established programmes and networks of their national institutes.
The main characteristic of the organisational structure should be that it is a network of working-groups. A certain structure that embodies this characteristic and can serve as a platform is necessary, but the structure should not dominate. The CIDREE structure should:
- bring creative people together;
- serve as an information platform, in order to identify important topics and to identify people that can fruitfully cooperate;
- be able to serve as an on-going context, that can function as a background for the two structural functions, mentioned above. This functions of "on-going context" and "overview" should be fulfilled by the establishment of a group of professional managers of institutes. Provisionally the group of December 1989 could serve as this group.

Perhaps the best picture to illustrate this structure is an umbrella.

2.1.4. The scope of the issues

Researchers and developers have different concerns. For example: long-term issues that are fundamental for future policy versus immediate imperatives to which curriculum developers have to respond and in which they have to cope with strong lobbies and many practical problems. The CIDREE should try to formulate broad areas where the two can meet. For example: the area of overcrowding in the curriculum; differentiation in the curriculum; the topic of personal and social development.

2.2. About the budget of CIDREE

2.2.1. Funds

For several institutes an annual fee of $ 15,000 is a lot of money. Some institutes also have administrative problems arising from governmental rules about investing money in cooperation abroad. For most institutes project or activity-focused funding is possible. A question is whether more institutes from one country could participate in the "Interim-CIDREE" and share the costs of the general fee.

2.2.2. Overheads

Experiences with similar ideas (for example a UK Consortium, the ISIP project of OECD, the IEA, some EC projects) show that the formula as such can be effective, but that a minimum of investment in overhead organisation and overhead budget is necessary.

2.2.3. Additional investment

Investment in CIDREE means that each institute has to deliver extra work and money. This can be done if it will be clear that this investment pays back in terms of: increased cooperation with other institutes, improved quality of own work, professional development of participating staff.

2.3. About the policy of CIDREE

2.3.1. Involvement

For some institutes the pressures on staff (deadlines, workload) are so high that the involvement of officers at short notice is very difficult. Also a low-scale involvement in the starting period is important in order to win goodwill.

2.3.2. Domain of cooperation

It will be important to define very precisely domains of cooperation (specific topics for workshops etc.) and also to define precisely the methods of cooperation in a given domain of cooperation. Both are necessary in order to avoid the "general conference syndrome", and also to guarantee the direct effect for the daily work of participating professionals.

2.3.3. Criteria

In its starting period the Interim-CIDREE should focus on specific themes and topics that meet criteria such as:
- several countries/institutes are involved or will probably be involved within a short period;
- the proposed activities are recognised as significant in terms of the working programmes and the national policy in the context of each of the participating institutes. This is also very important for reasons of continuity.
- some institutes or groups should have already done some work on the area that is chosen.

The consortium should be open for cooperation with other institutes in Western and Eastern Europe and with international organisations, but on the basis of the model of organic growth, not too rapid and not too structured. In the programme of activities there should be a balance of systematic approach and flexibility.

2.3.4. Workshops

Workshops organised within CIDREE should be product oriented. However, they should also give opportunities to learn through discussion and reflection, and to build personal relations and contacts. Therefore, no more than 10-25 participants should participate in one workshop or small conference and if possible they should come from no more than four or five countries. The organisation of these workshops should guarantee that there is enough opportunity for professional development (time, location, period of the year).

This text gives only a short and general report of a discussion of some five hours in which all kinds of examples and illustrations were given and in which interaction (reactions, questions, discussion) became more and more important.

INTERMEZZO

The late Friday night was used for informal discussion and small group discussion during dinner and for reflection in the initiating group of SLO and SVO.
On Saturday morning, 16 December 1989, this initiating group presented a formula for 1990 that reflected the discussion of Friday. This formula was elaborated in a new discussion and became a basis for conclusions. Very important in this process was that each representative offered one or more activities that could be organised and paid for by her or his institute.
In the next section the decisions and conclusions of the meeting are summarised. In section four we give the list of activities offered and the criteria developed for choice.

3. The agreed formula for the starting year 1990; conclusions, decisions, actions

3.1. Structure of the consortium

3.1.1. Principle

The core idea about the consortium is shared by all institutes. The main ideas from the discussion paper about formula, working methods and intentions are agreed. It is important that cooperation, programming of activities and organisation of activities are done by the institutes themselves. The consortium has to have the characteristic of mutual profit for the institutes: the working programme aims at cooperation in a well defined domain. This can give savings of work and energy in the institutes. The same can be true of other effects, such as professional development of staff members, networks, exchange of information.
But we do not want a very structured organisation and not a new heavy bureaucracy. We want to give the consortium the chance to grow organically on the basis of activities and personal relationships. This is a principle that should lead to careful, but conscious and well directed action in order to foster this process of organic growth. The budget, secretariat, formal problems about membership and statute have to be settled in a flexible, creative way, by using existing initiatives and by using existing structures and networks of the institutes.

3.1.2. Interim-CIDREE

In 1990 there will be no formal CIDREE (the name that provisionally has been accepted for our initiative). So the participating institutes will not have to commit themselves formally. We will speak of the "Interim-Consortium of Institutes for Development and Research in Education in Europe", I-CIDREE. The representatives of the twelve institutes who were gathered in the Hague on 15 and 16 December 1989 will act as if they are the Interim-CIDREE. They can do so, because they all have managerial responsibility in their institutes and have discussed and will discuss further the participation of their institutes in this Interim-CIDREE.

3.1.3. Development

The "Interim-CIDREE" may grow towards a more formal consortium, as described in the discussion paper, if this is needed in order to realise our ideas. But the philosophy of the consortium idea, as formulated in section 2 of this report, should not change through the formalisation that may be necessary if relationships are established with other institutes and organisations.

3.1.4. Internal structure

For the starting year 1990 the "group of December 1989" will function as a working party for the further elaboration of the Interim-CIDREE and also as the general council. There will be a programme committee of four persons and a provisional executive committee of four persons.

3.2. Activities in 1990; programme and conditions

3.2.1. The programme of activities

The programme committee will decide on a programme of some four to seven workshops or small conferences of 10-25 participants for 1990. These activities will be organised by one of the participating institutes. The programme will meet the criteria that has been formulated (see section 4) and will use the opportunities offered (see section 4) as its main source.
If possible, the programme committee will organise one or two activities before the summer of 1990. The programme will be organised in contact (letter, telephone, telefax) with offering institutes. If possible it will be circulated among the participating institutes by mid-February 1990.
The programme committee consists of:
- David McNicoll, SCCC, Scotland, chair
- Hans Hooghoff, SLO, the Netherlands, secretary
- Alfredo Fierro, Ministery of Education and Science, Spain
- Hans Hamber, NBE, Sweden.

3.2.2. The organic growth of the Interim-CIDREE

There is a provisional executive committee. It consists of:
- Hans Lodewijks, SVO, the Netherlands, chair
- Veikko Lepistö, NBGE, Finland
- Heinz Schirp, West Germany
- Seamus Hegarty, NFER, England

Its main tasks will be:
a. Preparation of proposals about the further development of the Interim CIDREE in 1990 and later. Matters of formalisation, relationships with international organisations, some kind of secretariat to assist committees and organisation, membership, communication, etc..
b. Contacts with other institutes, who want to join the Interim-CIDREE. For 1990 a limited number of staff members from non-participating institutes could join the workshops at their own expense.
c. Contacts with international organisations, especially with Unesco and the Council of Europe. About networking, secretariat, financial support, etc..
d. Preparation of a meeting of the "group of December 1989" on 8 and 9 June 1990 in NFER, Slough, England, hosted by NFER. Preparation of a Founding Conference for the CIDREE, if feasible in December 1990, to be hosted by SVO in the Hague, for its 25th anniversary. This conference could give an opportunity for some thematic workshops (see above about the Programme Committee). At the same time the conference could establish the CIDREE more formally or continue to elaborate the "Interim CIDREE". New potential members could participate in this conference.
f. Contact with Mrs. Emilie Barrier of CIEP, France, about the construction by the CIEP of an overview of the main activities

planned by the twelve participating institutes for coming years. The CIEP has offered to do this work on the basis of their language expertise and comparative work. This overview could serve as an important basis for further discussion about the programme for 1991 and further.

3.3.3. The costs

Workshops and small conferences (see "The programme of activities") will be organised by hosting member institutes (organisation, housing and meals, accommodation). Participants pay for their travel.
If the Programme Committee and/or the provisional executive committee have to meet (apart from telefax, telephone, letters) the same formula applies: hosting by one institute, travel by all.
SLO and SVO pay in 1990 for additional costs (report, leaflet, preparatory work, telephone and so on, contact visits).
The funding for the eventual founding conference of December 1990 is to be arranged by the provisional executive committee.

3.3.4. The language

The language in the "group of December 1989" will be English, as it was in the starting conference. In workshops for 10-25 people the language problem, if existing, will be solved by the hosting insitute with flexibility and pragmatism, depending on the participants and the facilities and the mixture of languages that are mastered actively or passively in the group of participants.

3.3.5. Liaison

Johan van Bruggen (SLO) will serve as a general consultant and as a liaison-officer; especially with international organisations.

4. Ideas offered for workshops and seminars; criteria

On Saturday morning each participant offered one or more possible topics for workshops or small conferences that her or his institute probably can or will offer to host in 1990. This was done for two reasons:

1. to summarise all kinds of ideas for activities that had been discussed in the earlier stage of the conference and to test their feasibility in the formula agreed for the "Interim-CIDREE";
2. to produce material for the programme committee in order to come to a rapid proposal for a programme in 1990.

N.B. Of course, there was some improvisation in these proposals and participants have to check at home if their proposals can stand, depending on the elaboration and the possibilities of colleagues in the institutes to participate in that elaboration.

In this same discussion also a set of criteria for activities has been established more precisely than on Friday. In this section the result of these two discussions is reported. As material for the Programme Committee and also to give an idea of the thinking of the group to readers of this report who were not present.

4.1. Offers for activities

(1) NFER (England) has offered to host the meeting of the "group of December 1989" on 8 and 9 June 1990.
Further, NFER is interested in:
(2) - cooperation in the assessment area, especially in the development of instruments for practical assessment, for example for oral assessment in language teaching and for practical assessment in mathematics teaching. A specific problem in the assessment area is multi-level modelling;
(3) - research and development in special education;
(4) - evaluation of large-scale initiatives.

(3) NCC (England) has budget and capacity to organise something in the area of special education and especially for the topic of differential education on level 1-2 (national curriculum
(4) England). The second point is the evaluation of the introduction of the national curriculum in England from 1991. The third point
(5) is the cooperation in the development of core skills for 16-18 years olds. NCC is also interested in participation in activities
(6) organised by other institutes in the area of development of the core curriculum for 12-16 years olds and in school curriculum
(7) development for small schools.

In Spain the Ministry of Education and Sciences is introducing a new scheme for the innovation of Spanish education. In due course, probably a new institute for curriculum development and an institute for evaluation and assessment will be established. There is already an institute for research and documentation. The
(6) offer is to organise a workshop for the development of the core curriculum for 12-16 year olds, especially for the 14-16 year
(7) olds, with specific attention to the development of attainment targets. Secondly, there is an offer to organise a workshop for the development of instruments for assessment in the same area.

(8) The CIEP (France) has already offered the analysis of the plans for activities of all participating institutes in 1990. Further the CIEP is interested in the organisation of a workshop for
(4) large-scale evaluation, especially the evaluation of school improvement as a process. The CIEP can also offer cheap hotel facilities for workshops on their own premises in Sèvres, near Paris.

(3) The SCRE (Scotland) can probably offer a workshop for cooperation in research and development for children with learning difficulties in schools for special education and normal primary
(9) schools. Perhaps the second offer could be a workshop on teachers' thinking (research and development).

(10) SVO (the Netherlands) offered to organise the founding conference within their programme on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of SVO. Apart from that, there could be a possibility to broaden a
(11) conference that has been planned already on multi-lingual and multi-cultural education in April 1990.

The INRP (France) offers to organise a workshop based on the
(12) research about teaching European literature and about the development of teaching modern civilization for modern language teaching. The INRP is also interested in participation in a
(6) workshop on the core curriculum for 12-16 years olds and thirdly
(2) in the assessment area.

The NBE (Sweden) could offer to organise a workshop on
(13) large-scale evaluation especially in system-wide evaluation with the use of students assessment. Secondly the NBE could offer a workshop on science education, especially about the topic of
(14) integration of subjects.

The SCCC (Scotland) could offer a workshop on values in
(15) education, related to social and personal development and focused on cross-curricular issues.

(15) LSW (West Germany) is especially interested in value education, but would prefer to offer a workshop or a small conference in cooperation with another participating institute. LSW is also
(16) interested in a workshop about the effective school movement in connection with curriculum development. LSW is also interested in a workshop in European integration and the significance of this
(17) process for curricula for secondary schools.

The NBGE (Finland) is in the process of merging with the Council for Vocational Education in Helsinki. The NBGE could offer a

(18) workshop about the connection between general education and vocational education for 16-19 years olds. The NBGE is also
(14) interested in science education and in the core curriculum for
(6) 12-16 years olds.

The university of Leuven is involved in several areas of research, for example: large-scale innovation (Vandenberghe), thinking skills (De Corte), longitudinal approach of secondary education, school climate for primary schools, early childhood education especially in the pre-school area. In the last area the
(19) University of Leuven could probably offer to organise a workshop.

SLO (the Netherlands) can offer a workshop for the definition of
(6) the core curriculum for 12-16 years olds, in terms of subjects, attainment targets and levels. A second offer of SLO could be a
(20) workshop on the development of interactive courseware for primary school children.

Several other topics were mentioned in the course of the discussions. Of course, most of the ideas need more elaboration and organisation. The elaboration should be based on a more detailed knowledge of the activities of the offering institutes at the moment and in the recent past as well as on a further detailed knowledge of their plans for the future.

4.2. Criteria

Two sets of criteria have been formulated.

Criteria for the content of activities are:
1. An activity is felt to be of common interest by at least four institutes that already plan activities in that area in the coming years.
2. An activity is situated in a problem area that is felt to be of significance by the whole "group of December 1989". Significance in terms of:
   - relevance for research and development in a general sense;
   - possible relevance for the activity plans of most institutes in coming years;
   - possibility to spread work over a period of at least one year.
3. Initially problems or topics are chosen from three broad areas:
   - the area of overcrowding in the curriculum, especially in education for 4-16 year olds;
   - the area of differentiation of education in schools. Differentiation is seen as a broad term, covering school organisation, classroom differentiation, relationship of the core curriculum with electives, individualisation, interactive and differentiated courseware and so on.
   - personal and social development of young persons in a rapidly changing European world.

Criteria regarding the format of the activities.
1. Activities have to be organised in a way that gives at least three types of output:
   - the possibility of use by the organising institute in terms of reflection, information exchange, production;
   - the visible product that can be of use by all participating institutes in the "Interim-CIDREE". This could be a report, a book

with specific ideas, a film, a workbook for professional staff and/or teachers, an arrangement for common research or common developmental action;
- effects on professional development of participating staff members.

2. Activities have to be organised by one institute in contact with some staff members of other institutes. The organising institute has to take care of the budget for the activity, except the travelling expenses of the participants.
3. Participants have to be involved in the preparation (exchanging materials, writing, electronic mail, some short visits and so on).
4. One or two members of the "group of December 1989" have to participate in the activity in order to serve as a linking pin.
5. The activity has to be organised in coordination with the Programme Committee. Coordination should especially concern: timing, choice of topic, definition of output for I-CIDREE, invitation and acceptance of participants.

5. What next?

At the moment this report is circulated (mid February 1990) to a wider target group than the "group of December 1989", the Programme Committee has developed plans for 4-5 activities. Information about this programme will be sent by the end of February or beginning of March 1990 to:
- the twelve participating institutes through the members of the "group of December 1989";
- other institutes or persons who, in relation to this report, indicate they want to be informed about the programme of I-CIDREE and consider participation.

Besides, in April 1990 we will try to send out a small newsletter about developments and plans, in order to inform staff members in participating institutes, international organisations and senior officers in institutes who have not been invited so far.

Information

Information can be obtained in several ways:
- by contacting one of the members of the "group of December 1989" (see list of names and addresses);
- by contacting Mr. Hans Hooghoff, secretary of the Programme Committee, about programme matters, SLO: tel. 31.53.840392 or 31.53.840840 (general number) or 31.53.840204 (Mrs. Ria Benamirouche);
- for general information or discussion:
  . Mr. Hans Lodewijks, chairman provisional executive committee. SVO: tel. 31.70.3469679, or
  . Mr. Johan van Bruggen, liaison officer with international organisations and interested institutes. SLO: tel. 31.53.840203 or 31.53.840840 (general number) or 31.53.840204 (Mrs. Ria Benamirouche).